

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 Mariah Maas, as Special Administrator for
7 the Estate of Tiffany Slatsky; Martin
8 Slatsky, as parent and legal guardian of
9 Cade Slatsky, a minor,

10 Plaintiffs,

11 v.

12 Christopher Candito, an individual; Andrew
13 Clapper, an individual; Nicholas Robison, an
14 individual; Andrew Stocker, an individual;
15 Steven Honsowetz, an individual; City of
16 North Las Vegas, a municipality; North Las
17 Vegas Fire Department, a City of North Las
18 Vegas agency; GNLV, LLC dba Golden
19 Nugget Hotel & Casino, a domestic limited
20 liability company; Domain Property Owner,
21 LLC, a foreign limited liability company;
22 Oaktree Capital Management, L.P., a foreign
23 limited partnership; et al.,

24 Defendants.

25 And related claims.
26

Case No. 2:22-cv-00568-GMN-DJA

Order

27 This action arises out of Tiffany Slatsky's death via drug overdose after she attended a
28 party held by North Las Vegas firefighters and EMTs with her husband—also a
29 firefighter/EMT—Defendant Christopher Candito. Plaintiffs move to amend their complaint to
30 clarify facts, remove certain defendants, add Tiffany Slatsky's father as a plaintiff, and parse out
31 Plaintiffs' constitutional claims. (ECF No. 80). No party has responded to the motion.

32 Because courts in the Ninth Circuit grant leave to amend with liberality and because no
33 party responded, the Court grants Plaintiffs' motion to amend. Under Rule 15(a)(2) of the
34 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, "[t]he court should freely give leave [to amend] when justice so
35 requires." Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)(2). There is a strong public policy in favor of permitting

1 amendment. *Bowles v. Reade*, 198 F.3d 752, 757 (9th Cir. 1999). The Ninth Circuit has made
2 clear that courts should apply Rule 15(a) with “extreme liberality.” *Eminence Capital, LLC v.*
3 *Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048, 1051 (9th Cir. 2003). Additionally, under Local Rule 7-2(d), the
4 failure of an opposing party to file points and authorities in response to any motion constitutes a
5 consent to the granting of the motion. LR 7-2(d). Considering the strong public policy in favor
6 of permitting amendment, the Ninth Circuit’s caution to apply Rule 15(a) with extreme liberality,
7 and that no party filed a response, granting leave to amend is appropriate here. The Court thus
8 grants Plaintiffs’ motion to amend.

9
10 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that Plaintiffs’ motion to amend (ECF No. 80) is
11 **granted**. Plaintiffs shall file and serve their amended complaint as required under Local Rule 15-
12 1.

13
14 DATED: December 29, 2023

15
16 
17 _____
18 DANIEL J. ALBREGTS
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28